No. _____ Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
10-541 AUG 12 2010
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The Supreme Court of the United States

CONNIE RHODES,
Captain, M.D., F.S.,
and
DR. ORLY TAITZ, ESQ.
Attorney for the Petitioner, Interested Party,
Petitioners,

v.

THOMAS D. MACDONALD, Colonel,
Garrison Commander, Fort Benning,
GEORGE STEUBER, Deputy
Commander, Fort Benning,
ROBERT M. GATES,
Secretary of Defense,
BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA,

Respondents.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Dr. Orly Taitz, Esq.
29839 Santa Margarita Parkway
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
(949) 683-5411

Counsel of Record for Petitioners

LANTAGNE LEGAL PRINTING
801 East Main Street Suite 100 Richmond, Virginia 23219 (800) 847-0477

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Does the ruling of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in *Rhodes v. MacDonald* violate the First and Fifth Amendments to the United States Constitution?

2. Does the ruling of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in *Rhodes v. MacDonald* conflict with the Supreme Court's ruling in *Offutt v. United States,* 348 U.S. 11, 13 (1954).

3. Is a Federal Judge allowed to persecute a Civil Rights attorney and sanction her for merely bringing Civil rights violation cases to his court?

4. Are members of US military reduced to the level of slaves or serfs, if they are refused a hearing on the merits of their grievances in both military and federal courts and their attorneys are harassed and intimidated and verbally assaulted and insulted by a presiding Federal Judge?

5. Can a federal judge arbitrarily decide, what civil Rights violations case he wants to hear and which case he will not hear, and arbitrarily sanction a civil rights defender attorney for bringing to court a case that he doesn't feel like hearing on the merits, as it is not beneficial for his career?

6. Should a federal judge forward a case to the jury for determination on issues of fact and law, when a case involves a president of the United

States, his legitimacy and eligibility, which by default, affects the career of such judge?

7. Is the whole nation de facto reduced to the level of slaves or serfs, when one without valid vital records, without Social Security number of his own and without a valid long form birth certificate is able to get in the position of the President; and Congress is refusing to hear this issue, claiming that it is for the courts to decide and the courts are refusing to hear this issue, claiming that it is for the Congress to decide?

8. Should there be a decision from the Supreme court, clarifying legitimacy of US president or an order to the lower court to hear the issue on the merits?

9.. What Constitutes "natural born citizen" according to Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ..... p 1

OPINIONS BELOW p2

BASIS FOR JURISDICTION p2

STATUTORY PROVISION p3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE p3

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION p7

A. THE 11TH CIRCUIT HAS IMPERMISSIBLY EXPANDED THE SCOPE OF RULE 11 AT THE EXPENSE OF THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH CLAUSES OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION .. P7

B. RHODES V. MACDONALD CONFLICTS WITH THIS COURT'S RULING IN OFFUTT V. UNITED STATES p10

C. SANCTIONS ARE INCONSISTENT WITH RULE11 ..... p11

D. CAPTAIN RHODES CASE p15

E. MAJOR COOK CASE, EXCEPTION TO MOOTNESS DOCTRINE.....p19

F. ORDER BY JUDGE LAND SHOWS CLEAR BIAS.....p.20

G. SANCTIONS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS INFRINGEMENT ON FREE SPEECH.....p23

H. ACTIONS BY JUDGE LAND IN DENYING MOTION TO RECUSE AND MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME WERE IMPROPER.....p24

I. JUDGE LAND ERRED IN HIS ASSERTIONS , THAT THE INJURY WAS NOT IMMINENT.....p25

J. ACTIONS BY JUDGE LAND CONSTITUTED VIOLATION OF JUDICIAL ETHICS.....p26

K. ACTIONS BY JUDGE LAND ARE AGAINST PUBLIC POLICY, ENDANGER THE PUBLIC AND ENDANGER NATIONAL SECURITY.....p27

L. ACTIONS BY JUDGE LAND WERE AKIN TO AIDING AND ABETTING FELONY AND MISPRISION OF FELONY.....p27

CONCLUSION.....p37

APPENDIX:

Taitz v. MacDonald, Memorandum of Decision and Order, March 15, 2010 .....A.1-2

Rhodes v. MacDonald, Memorandum of Decision and Order, July 5, 2001.....A.3-18

August 23, 2010 letter from the clerk of the Supreme Court, granting 60 days extension.....B.19

May 14 Final Order from the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals C.20

May 24, 2010 Mandate from the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals.....D.21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Gerstein v Pugh, 420 US 102, 110 n. 11, 95 S.Ct. 854,43 L.Ed.2d..... p 19.

Offutt v. United States,
348 U.S. 11, 13 (1954) p2

Oregon AdvocacyCtr v Mink, 322 F 3d 1101, 1118(9th Cir 2003).....p 20

Mindes , 453 F.2d 197 (5th Cir 1971).....p 20

Rhodes v, Macdonald,
368 Fed. Appx. 949 (11th Cir 2010)..... p2

Rhodes v. MacDonald,
2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84743 (M.D. Ga., September 16, 2009) p2

Rhodes v. MacDonald,
2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85485 (M.D. Ga., September 18, 2009) p2

Rhodes v. MacDonald,
670 F. Supp. 2d 1363 (M.D. Ga., October 13, 2009) p2

Roe v Wade 410 US 113, 125, 93 S. Ct. 705, 35 L.Ed.2d 147 (1973).....p 20

Taitz v. Macdonald,
79 U.S.L.W. 3091 (2010) p2

Ukranian American Bar Assn'n v Baker, 893 F. 2d 1374, 1377 (DC Cir 1990).....p 20

STATUTES

State of Hawaii, statute 338-5.....p14
State of Hawaii, statute 338-6.....p14
State of Hawaii statute 338-17.....p14
28 USC §455 (a),.....p25
42 USC §408(a)(7)(B).....p28
18 USC §1621.....p28
18 USC § 371.....p28

Federal
Constitution of the United States, First Amendment.....p37
Constitution of the United States, Fifth Amendment.....p37
Constitution of the United States, Ninth amendment.....p37
Constitution of the United States, Fourteenth Amendment.....p36
Constitution of the United States, Article 2, section.....p16

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,Rule11.....p.3

INTRODUCTION

On September 15, 2010 Steven Breyer, Justice of the Supreme Court, appeared on the CNN Larry King show. When asked whether he will attend future "State of the Union" addresses in light of Barack Obama's verbal attack on the Justices of the Supreme Court during the last "State of the Union Address", Justice Breyer responded, that he will attend because the public needs to know, that they are protected, and that these judges and this court will protect even ones, that are not popular, that the Constitution protects them. He proceeded by reminiscing about his trip to Russia in 1993. He was invited by Yeltsin to a meeting with Russian judges to assist them in building a new fledgling democracy after years of Marxist tyranny. Yeltsin promised those judges, that he will protect them from "telephone justice" and Justice Breyer was on hand to assure them that democracy is possible.

The case at hand is probably the worst form of "telephone justice". The U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia in an ill advised and unconstitutional attempt to shield the President from judicial scrutiny of his eligibility to serve violated the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, as well as the Ninth and Fourteenth amendments. Judge Clay D. Land (hereinafter Land) refused to hear the case on the merits, citing his desire to abstain from the matters of the military and simply decided to intimidate the plaintiff and the counsel for the plaintiff, as well as members of the legal profession at large, keep them silent

regarding Obama's lack of eligibility for U.S. Presidency and asserted $20,000 in sanctions against counsel for the plaintiff, the Appellant, when she tried to advocate further via motions. The Court of Appeals in upholding the District Court, did not articulate it's reasoning. The District Court's ruling in *Rhodes* undid a fifty year trend in federal case law and is opposite to the position of this Court in *Offutt v. United States,* 348 U.S. 11, 13 (1954) which calls for judicial restraint.

OPINIONS BELOW

The unpublished opinion of the United States Court of Appeal for Eleventh Circuit, *Rhodes v. Macdonald*, 368 Fed. Appx. (11th Cir. 2010) was filed March 15, 2010 [Appendix 1-2]. This Court also denied a Stay Request on August 16, 2010 in *Taitz v. Macdonald*, 79 U.S.L.W. 3091.

BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

This Petition for Certiorari under Rule 10 for federal civil rights questions is timely under Rule 13.1 as less than 90 days from denial by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit with an extension granted to cure deficiencies pursuant to Rule 14.5. Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals initially denied the Appeal on March 15th. Appellant filed a Motion for Reconsideration, which was denied on May 14th, 2010. The final order was issued on May 14th, 2010. The mandate was issued on May 24, 2010. Appellant filed a timely Petition for a Writ of Certiorari on August 12, 2010. On August 23, 2010 Appellant got a 60 days extension for

corrections. Extension was given by Chief Clerk William K. Sutter and signed by clerk S. Elliott. Current submission was made timely within the 60 days provided in the extension.

STATUTORY PROVISION

This appeal is based on the tension between the Eleventh Circuit judicial interpretation of F.R.C.P. Rule Rule 11(c)(3) and the Constitution of the United States.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The appellant in this case is Dr. Orly Taitz, Esq, seeking a reversal of the $20,000 Rule 11 sanctions assessed against her by Land.. Rule 11 sanctions are typically applied when the case is not sufficiently investigated by the counsel prior to bringing it to court. The facts of the underlying case *Rhodes v MacDonald* 4:09-CV-106 Middle District of GA were researched for a year. Licensed investigators were used, Taitz has reached the office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in her investigation of the case. She is seeking a reversal of sanctions, as well as limited rule 11 discovery, to show that her actions were not frivolous, but rather reasonable and justified, that it is the most important case today and possibly most important in US history, as sanctions were asserted to obfuscate illegitimacy of Barack Hussein Obama for US presidency. Land started his order with a statement comparing Taitz to Alice in Wonderland and saying, that just saying so, does not make it so.

Unfortunately, Land did not think of the underlying case, where **Obama is saying**, that he is a legitimate President and Commander in Chief, however in light of the fact that multiple experts show him using Social Security numbers of others, not having a valid Social Security number of his own, not willing to unseal his original 1961 Long Form birth certificate with the name of the doctor and hospital; **just saying he is legitimate, does not make it so, does not** make him legitimate and discovery is warranted. Taitz was subjected to ridicule and insults on account of Land christening her "Alice in Wonderland". She was even put on the hit list of the Southern Poverty Law Center under the name "Alice in Wonderland". While Taitz appreciates Land's fondness of Lewis Carroll, it is important to point, that US military officers did not fall in the rabbit hole and are not looking for an adventure. It is important for them, as well as the whole nation to know, whether the Commander in Chief is legitimate, and where does his allegiance lie.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

Taitz has done extensive research for over a year and provided the court with information, showing that Barack Hussein Obama not only didn't provide any proof of his Natural Born Citizen status, but also used multiple Social Security numbers of deceased individuals, as well as numbers never assigned. Taitz has presented the trial court with an affidavit from Mr. Neil Sankey, a licensed investigator, former Scotland Yard officer, working with the elite anti organized crime and anti communist proliferation units. This report shows,

that according to National databases Choice Point and Lexis Nexis, there are multiple Social Security Numbers connected to the name Barack Obama and Barry Obama. None of these numbers were issued in the State of Hawaii, where Mr. Obama claims to have been born. Selective Service official on line records show Mr. Obama using Social Security number 042-68-4425, which was issued in the state of CT to an individual born in 1890. Even today Mr. Obama is residing in the White House, using this Social Security number, which makes the legal action brought by Taitz, reasonable and not frivolous.

Taitz has brought two cases on behalf of members of the US military, seeking stay of their deployment, pending verification of legitimacy of Mr. Obama's status as the President and Commander in Chief. Both of these cases were heard by Judge Clay D. Land in Columbus GA.

The First Action was brought on behalf of a member of active reserves Major Stefan Cook. Upon revocation of Major Cook's orders, Judge Land has dismissed the case, refusing to consider the fact that Major Cook was **also fired from his position as a defense contractor employee in a clear retaliation for his filing the above legal action against Barack Obama.** The court, also, refused to consider the fact, that two other high ranked officers: a Major General and a Lt. Colonel have joined the above action and an argument was brought forward, that this is a case of a repeated violation of the First Amendment right for redress of grievances, which evades judicial review every time such orders are revoked, as well as an argument, that revocation of

orders to deploy in light of request to produce documents attesting to Obama's legitimacy indirectly indicate, that the military had nothing to show.

A second case was brought on behalf of an active duty Flight Surgeon Captain Connie Rhodes. While in the first case the military could justify revocation of the orders by the fact that Major Cook was a reservist, this argument would not be justifiable with an active military, so the military and judiciary subjected both the plaintiff and her attorney Taitz to intimidation and retaliation. Initially Captain Rhodes was not allowed to attend her hearing and threatened with court martial. Later Judge Land dismissed the case based on the Doctrine of Abstention, stating that he does not want to get involved in the internal matters of the military and assessed the cost of litigation upon the plaintiff. Potentially such cost of litigation could be tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars, that could have been assessed in fees for the three attorneys, representing the defendants, those fees were used as a leverage against the plaintiff to convince her not to appeal and abruptly withdraw from the case. At the same time Land has assessed $20,000 worth of sanctions against Taitz, claiming violation of Rule 11. Sanctions were appealed to the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals and the appeal denied with one sentence, stating that the appeal was not convincing. No explanation was provided by the 11th circuit, as to what was found to be unconvincing, no oral argument was allowed, no explanation as to why no oral argument was allowed.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

A. THE 11TH CIRCUIT HAS IMPERMISSIBLY EXPANDED THE SCOPE OF RULE 11 AT THE EXPENSE OF THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH CLAUSES OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The Eleventh Circuit is mistaken in assuming that Land may *sua sponte* find an attorney in violation of F.R.C.P. Rule 11 and sanction her simply because he does not like her politics. In the infamous words of Land it is clear that Petitioner's speech disagreed with the judge's politics:

> "Instead, she uses her Complaint as a platform for spouting political rhetoric, such as her claims that the President is "an illegal"" *Rhodes v. MacDonald*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84743, *10 (M.D. Ga., September 16, 2009) (Appendix A-9).

> "Finally, it is clear that Plaintiff's counsel seeks to continue to use the federal judiciary as a platform to further her political **"birther agenda."** *Rhodes v. MacDonald,* 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85485, *7 (M.D. Ga., September 18, 2009).(emphasis added).

Land simply did not like the fact, that Taitz brought forward cases, dealing with the **Natural Born Citizen** requirement of the U.S. Constitution, he used a pejorative term "birther agenda", clearly showing, that he wanted to stop Constitutionally protected dissident speech of a plaintiff and his attorney, as it endangered the position of the sitting

president.

Though "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. ," U.S. Const., Amendment 1, the Eleventh Circuit and Middle District have gone a long way towards eroding this Clause. The Middle District of Georgia went out of its way to repeatedly sanction an attorney whose only crime was to be outspoken about the eligibility of the President to hold office.

The F.R.C.P. Rule 11 Notes of Advisory Committee on 1983 amendments to Rules endorses the application of due process (presumably based on Constitutional concerns) as follows: "The procedure obviously must comport with due process requirements."

It is not even clear what due process procedure the District Court applied. FRCP Rule 11(c)(3) states: "On the Court's Initiative. On its own, the court may order an attorney, law firm, or party to show cause why conduct specifically described in the order has not violated Rule 11(b).

There was no hearing by the District's Court own admission, it sanctioned the Petitioner not once but twice after a previous finding without a formal hearing that her underlying pleadings were frivolous (See Appendix A3 et seq.) , shrugging off Due Process concerns as follows:

"Requiring additional procedures would

> result in an unjustifiable disregard of the Court's interest in efficiently monitoring and using judicial resources, with no measurable benefit to the legitimate interests of counsel." *Rhodes v. MacDonald,* 670 F. Supp. 2d 1363, 1383 (M.D. Ga., October 13, 2009).

Shockingly Land believed that enforcing the U.S. Constitution, particularly as it relates to the President of the United States did not represent "measurable benefit to the legitimate interests"

> "As previously explained, the Court finds that Ms. Taitz is not entitled to that full panoply of rights under the circumstances of this case. The process used in this case protected Ms. Taitz's rights to the extent required by constitutional due process." *Ibid.*

In their zeal to shield President's eligibility from examination, the courts have even ignored the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution: "... [N]or shall any ... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law..." Petitioner was sanctioned $20,000 and her ability to practice law placed jeopardized without appropriate due process.

The Eleventh Circuit approach is in error. Federal judges who sanction attorneys *sua sponte* should be held to strict scrutiny and not some truncated form of due process set by a judge who simply wanted to silence an attorney, who was a dissident and questioned the legitimacy of the sitting president.

B. *RHODES V. MACDONALD* CONFLICTS WITH THIS COURT'S RULING IN *OFFUTT V. UNITED STATES*

In their zeal to President's eligibility from examination, the courts have even ignored this Court's own well established case law on the subject. In *Offut v. United States* this Court found:

> "Of course personal attacks or innuendoes by a lawyer against a judge, with a view to provoking him, only aggravate what may be an obstruction to the trial. The vital point is that in sitting in judgment on such a misbehaving lawyer the judge should not himself give vent to personal spleen or respond to a personal grievance. These are subtle matters, for they concern the ingredients of what constitutes justice. Therefore, justice must satisfy the appearance of justice" Offutt *v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11, 13 (1954)

However, the Eleventh Circuit's stubborn blanket refusal to apply the restraint endorsed in *Offutt* to *Rhodes* seriously undermines *Offutt*. **The The *Rhodes* standard now espoused in the Eleventh Circuit permits federal judges to severely punish attorneys simply because such attorney brings a case, that might expose illegal behavior of high ranked governmental officials, or sanctions against an attorney, who is a dissident against the President. This is exactly what this Court ruled against in *Offutt*. The *Rhodes* standard must be struck down as**

unconstitutional and petitioner Taitz given her day in court. Rhodes is the worst case of "telephone justice", bias and abuse of process this country has ever seen.

C. SANCTIONS ARE INCONSISTENT WITH RULE 11

Typically rule 11th sanctions are assessed when an attorney does not perform sufficient inquiry. In this case Taitz worked around the clock for a year and obtained more information than anyone else in regards to Obama's illegitimacy for the US presidency and in regard to massive fraud perpetrated by Mr. Obama in placing his name on the ballot and obfuscating all of his vital records. Judge Land states in the introduction to his order that "Rule 11 sanctions prohibit a lawyer from asserting claims or legal positions that are not well-founded under existing law or through the modifications, extension, or expansion of existing law". Land failed to point any single claim made by Taitz that would **violate any single law**.

Land stated, that per Rule 11 an attorney should "not clog the court with frivolous motions or appeals", however Land did not point to anything **specifically** frivolous in the motions filed by Taitz. His final ruling in the underlying case was, that he will not proceed with the case for the reason of abstention, as he does not want to get involved in the matters of the military. The doctrine of abstention is used only in certain cases. In a similar case of *Mindes* , 453 F.2d 197 (5th Cir 1971) circuit court of appeals has put forward specific guidelines and a

three prong test, according to which abstention would not be appropriate. If, as in the case at hand, the plaintiff has

a. exhausted all avenues available in the military,

b. established that the issue relates to violation of fundamental Constitutional rights of the plaintiff

c. and the issue is not technical,

abstention will not be appropriate.

In *Rhodes*

a. Taitz, as an attorney, who is representing over 200 members of the military, reached Captain James Crawford, ESQ, the legal counsel for Admiral Mike Mullins, Chairman of the joint Chiefs of staff, who stated that nothing can be done within the military, as technically the Commander in Chief is considered to be a civilian.

b. The issue violated the plaintiff's Constitutional right of Redress of Grievances

c. The issue was not technical, it was not an issue of using one weapon instead of another, it was an issue of Constitutionality of orders of the Commander in Chief.

Taitz **fully complied with the**

requirements of the *Mindes* guidelines, and not only sanctions were not appropriate, but an underlying decision by judge Land was inappropriate and unsupported by law, by the Constitution, and by precedents. Moreover, even if assuming arguendo an underlying decision by Land would somehow be considered valid and supported by law, it still does not mean that bringing the case to court was frivolous, as there was a clear possibility of Rhodes falling into same category as Mindes.

He further states that "Rule 11 also prohibits an attorney from using the courts for a purpose unrelated to the resolution of legitimate legal cause of action". Again, Land did not provide an example of anything that Taitz has done that was unrelated to the cause of action. She simply provided evidence that according to National databases Obama used multiple social security numbers, he never unsealed his original birth certificate. Abbreviated Certification of Live Birth, that was produced recently, in 2007, did not have any specific information: no name of the doctor, no name of the hospital, no signatures. Taitz was justified in demanding verification of legitimacy of the Commander in Chief. There was absolutely nothing brought in the pleading and in the hearing in court that justified an assertion by Land that Taitz used the court for purpose unrelated to the litigation.

In his order of sanctions Land intentionally misrepresented each and every fact of the case. Land started by misrepresenting the prior case of Major Cook, a reservist, who was also questioning legitimacy of Barack Obama, and who was also represented by Taitz. Land stated that Taitz tried to

use the legal process as a "foundation for her political agenda". **It is sad and appalling that a federal judge will consider adherence to US Constitution to be a "political agenda." This is not a political agenda, it is the Supreme law of the land that Land took an oath to defend.** Land stated that "she (Taitz) seeks to use the court's power to compel discovery in her efforts to force the president to produce a birth certificate that is satisfactory to her and her followers". In reality Taitz has presented Judge Land with overwhelming evidence that Obama has never presented his original birth certificate, that is still sealed in the Health Department of the state of Hawaii (if it even existed). This is of particular importance, since the State of Hawaii has statute 338-17, that allows foreign born children of Hawaiian residents to obtain Hawaiian birth certificate; statute 338-5 that allows one to obtain a birth certificate based on a statement of one relative only; statute 338-6 that allows one to get a late birth certificate. Taitz has presented an affidavit from a licensed forensic document expert Sandra Ramsey Lines, who attested to the fact, that abbreviated Certification Of Live Birth, cannot be considered genuine without examining the original birth certificate. All of this information, coupled with Obama's refusal to present any vital records in spite of over a hundred legal actions filed in the courts all over the country, provided reasonable basis to assume Obama's illegitimacy to the US presidency.

Land intentionally misrepresented the ultimate relief, that the plaintiff in that case was seeking. Land stated, that "the Army has revoked

the deployment orders. As a result Major Cook received the ultimate relief that he purportedly sought in the legal action: a revocation of the deployment order." The plaintiff, major Cook, was a decorated army officer, who has served in the field of battle. He wanted to serve, however he did not want to serve under the illegitimate Commander in Chief. The misrepresentation of these facts was not only intellectually dishonest, but a vicious attack on a decorated Army Officer, calculated to denigrate him in the eyes of the public and negatively affect his prospects for future employment.

Land improperly ignored the fact that reservist Major Cook was also fired from his position as a defense contractor employee as a result of the pressure applied by the military on his employer, pursuant to his filing of the above complaint. There was an outstanding issue of wrongful termination of Major Cook, of violation of whistleblower statutes. **Judge Land ignored large part of the case, where two other high ranking officers a Major General and a Lt. Colonel joined the case, and Taitz argued that this is a an issue of violation of Constitutional rights, that repeats itself, but evades review, akin to *Roe v Wade***

D. CAPTAIN RHODES CASE

Yet again in his order Land misrepresents the facts. As stated previously, Taitz has followed the precedent of *Mindes* and showed the court that she exhausted all *means* of redress within the military, that it was an issue of violation of constitutional rights of a member of the military, it was not a technical issue, and therefore subject to review and

not subject to abstention. Taitz has provided the court with the argument, whereby the members of the US military are sworn to uphold the Constitution, which includes Article 2, section 1. Demanding the members of the US military to violate the oath of office and serve under the illegitimate Commander in Chief, whose orders will be illegal is a damage in itself. Land has stated, that Taitz has resorted to political rhetoric. In reality, as the pleadings and transcripts have shown, Taitz has provided the court with the reasonable examples of members of the military following illegal orders. Taitz has provided the court with an example of three children, members of her husband's family, who were killed in the Holocaust, when Nazi officers told these three young kids to dig their own graves, shot them and threw them into those graves. Judge Land called those statements "political rhetoric", even though those were appropriate examples of consequences of members of the military following unlawful orders.

Land claimed, that the fact that Capt. Rhodes questioned the deployment order, but not other orders was suspect. In reality this was logical and appropriate. It showed that Rhodes did not act frivolously, but rather acted only when an important order came down the chain of command from Obama, as the Commander in Chief, and when this order related to her personally. Clearly, when one is asked to risk her life pursuant an order, one has standing to bring a legal action to court and seek judicial determination of validity of such order, one can show imminent harm associated with such an order. It was an appropriate action, brought at an

appropriate time, in an appropriate jurisdiction. The court was respectfully asked for a limited discovery and declaratory relief, which could be accomplished within one day. Instead, Land has chosen to use his position as a pulpit to harass and denigrate the plaintiff and Taitz. While it was clear that Land's actions were calculated to calm down the military in relation to Obama's legitimacy and preserve the scheduled deployment, at the end of the day Land's actions only added disgust towards the actions of the administration and the judiciary. Currently, yet another officer, Lt. Col Terry Lakin is facing a court martial for challenging the same type of order. Other recent events show, that Taitz was correct in her assertions, as the Parliament of Kenya issued a transcript of March 25, 2010 speech of Minister of Lands James Orenga, stating that Obama was born in Kenya. Land believed, that based on his threats Taitz will abandon her client and will not pursue her clients interests. Taitz, was bound by duty of zealous representation of her client and filed proper motions for stay of deployment pending reconsideration. Land sanctioned her $20,000 for filing that motion. As stated, based on the Mindes precedent not only was the action not frivolous, but Land had a duty to intervene.

Land has brought an argument, that Taitz did not show damage to her client and that "if the President were to be found not to be eligible for office, that would not mean that all soldiers in the military would be authorized to disregard their duty as American soldiers and disobey their command." This is an absurd argument. When a member of the US military is forced to violate her oath of office and serve under illegitimate orders, that represents

damage. If one were to follow Judge Land's logic, than tomorrow somebody like Mahmud Ahmadinejad or Hugo Chavez can buy a Presidential election, and the members of US military will have zero recourse.

Another argument by Land, is his claim that he had no jurisdiction to hear the case. The jurisdiction was proper for hearing the case, as Rhodes was deploying from Fort Benning, GA, she was asking to investigate evidence and ascertain whether fraud was committed. **Even if arguendo Land didn't have jurisdiction, it would have justified transferring the case to another jurisdiction, not sanctioning the attorney.**

Yet another argument by Land "...if the President were elected to the office by knowingly and fraudulently concealing evidence of his constitutional disqualifications, then a mechanism exists for removing him from office. Except for the Chief Justice's role in presiding over the trial in Senate, that mechanism does not involve the judiciary." Again Judge Land intentionally misrepresents the case, as he was never asked to remove the president from office, he was asked to simply examine the evidence and make a declaratory relief. Such discovery would have been sufficient for ascertainment of legitimacy of deployment orders and could have been forwarded to Congress and to the US attorney's office. Yet again, such motion for declaratory relief in no way justifies any sanctions against Counsel.

Another totally absurd argument by Land "Perhaps he looks too young and says that he stopped counting birthdays from age thirty....should Miss. Taitz be

allowed to file a lawsuit and have a court order him to produce his birth certificate?" Taitz did not bring her law suit based on mere observation. She submitted an affidavit from a forensic document expert and a licensed investigator. Clearly the case was brought not based on something empirical as looks, but based on evidence. This argument brought by Land was unreasonable, it showed bias and misrepresented the facts.

E. MAJOR COOK CASE, EXCEPTION TO MOOTNESS DOCTRINE

Judge Land issued sanctions, referring to Rhodes v MacDonald and Cook v Good . Land claimed that the actions were frivolous and that Cook was moot after military revoked the deployment orders for Cook. Land erred in not considering the fact that injury sustained by the members of the US military falls under a category of cases that are "capable of repetition, yet evading review". In Gerstein v Pugh 420 US 102, 110 n. 11, 95 S.Ct. 854, 43 L.Ed.2d Supreme Court of the US held the exception to mootness doctrine for violations "capable of repetition, yet evading review" applied because the Constitutional violation was likely to be repeated but would not last long enough to be reviewed before becoming moot... In oral argument the undersigned counselor equated this issue to Roe v Wade 410 US 113, 125, 93 S. Ct. 705, 35 L.Ed.2d 147 (1973) and the issue of women being pregnant and not being able to have their case heard, as it was rendered moot after each delivery. *In Oregon AdvocacyCtr v Mink,* 322 F 3d 1101, 1118(9th Cir 2003) it was held that plaintiffs have standing if

they are challenging an ongoing governmental policy, even if specific injury no longer exists. Here we have an ongoing policy of concealment of records of the Commander in Chief. To this point DC Circuit court held that when a complaint challenges an acknowledgement or apparent governmental policy, the government cannot prevail by arguing that the controversy became moot when the particular situation at issue resolved itself. Ukranian American Bar Assn'n v Baker, 893 F. 2d 1374, 1377 (DC Cir 1990). Two more officers joined Cook. Thousands of similar orders are issued on a daily basis. Clearly this issue is capable of repetition and evades any meaningful review on the merits.

F. ORDER BY LAND SHOWS CLEAR BIAS.

The decision and order by Land shows clear bias, he used a pejorative term "birther", describing Taitz as the leader of the "birther" movement.

Land acted in a fashion unbecoming a judge, when he rudely tried to ridicule Taitz and assassinate her character. One of his statements was "perhaps an eccentric citizen has become convinced that the President is an alien from Mars, and the court should order DNA testing to enforce the Constitution." Clearly there is a huge difference between actions of some eccentric person and attorney like Taitz **bringing affidavits from licensed investigators and experts**.". Land rudely called Taitz efforts "antics". In reality Land's actions were antics. Massive fraud of American citizens perpetrated by Obama will be punished and history will not look kindly on Land's antics and on any other judge who was aiding and abetting

Obama's massive fraud.

Land has intentionally misrepresented the facts and attacked both Major Cook and Captain Rhodes. Both plaintiffs clearly stated that they are willing to deploy and serve, provided that they are following legitimate orders. Land intentionally misrepresented them as ones, who do not want to serve.

The order of sanctions issued by Land on 10.13.09 ridicules the fact that Taitz mentioned Justice Thurgood Marshall. In reality there is no difference between what Justice Marshall was doing and what Taitz was doing. Justice Marshall was fighting to uphold the Constitutional rights of African –Americans. **Taitz is fighting to uphold the Constitutional rights of every American citizen, a right of redress of grievances.** If during the career of Thurgood Marshal, he would've encountered a judge like Land, who would've fined him $20,000 for trying to protect the citizens' constitutional rights, this would have put a stop to the civil rights movement of the 50s and the 60s and someone like Obama would have no chance of ever being anywhere near the ballot.

LAND VIOLATED THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT PROTECTION TO DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW

Land ridiculed Taitz notion that her clients deserved Fourteenth amendment protection. Ms. Ausprung, attorney for the Department of Defense

argued that there is a difference between illegal orders and illegitimate President. Her rational was, that even if Obama is not legitimate, it does not make the orders issued by him illegal. Land upheld this logic and attacked Taitz in his order claiming that Taitz cheapened the memory of Marshall by comparing her legal actions to ones of Marshall, because Marshall protected the rights of the black children, who were sent to inferior schools, while Rhodes is an adult, who is refusing deployment based on the speculation that the Commander in Chief is not legitimate.

First of all, Taitz presented legal evidence and not speculation. Second of all, does Land's order mean that the equal protection rights exist only for children and not for adults? Do those rights exist only for Blacks and not for Whites? If that is the case, than we have reverse discrimination, it means that we throw away the notion of equal protection, that we lay it at the altar of political correctness.

Now, let's look at this argument of the order being valid regardless of whether the person giving the order has legitimacy in occupying such franchise, or whether he is an illegitimate usurper.

Let's imagine for a moment that someone, a janitor, decides to play a prank. He puts on a black robe and sits on the bench and signs an order for an officer to be deployed, Let's say, he signs such order when Land is on a brake. Officer brings a complaint, that the order was illegal. Does it mean, that if the order seems to be legal on it's face, it is actually legal, regardless of whether the person, who signed

it, is actually a judge or a janitor playing a prank? Is an attorney for such officer supposed to be sanctioned $20,000 for merely bringing the claim to court and asking to evaluate it's validity?

Such logic represents complete insanity.

G. SANCTIONS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS INFRINGEMENT ON FREE SPEECH

Every US citizen has a First Amendment right to free speech. Additionally, attorneys have a right to engage in a practice of law, which represents a form of commercial speech. Actions by Land represented an assault on such protected speech of both Taitz and her clients. **When a Federal Judge uses his gavel as a cane for public flogging of an attorney, who is a Civil rights defender, who works pro bono to protect her clients' First Amendment rights to free speech and for redress of grievances, such federal judge betrays his oath of office and aids and abets an onslaught on the US Constitution, abets conversion of the Constitutional Republic into tyranny**.

SANCTIONS INFRINGE UPON THE RIGHT OF THE CITIZENS AND MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY TO HAVE LEGAL REPRESENTATION.

Members of US military are bound by their oath of office to uphold the Constitution, they have a Constitutionally protected first amendment right for redress of grievances. They have tried to address

their grievance within the agency, within the military, but were denied such right, when the highest legal authority, Legal Counsel of Admiral Mulin, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has written, that the issue of legality of the Commander in Chief cannot be resolved within the military, since Commander in Chief is a civilian. Members of the military are within their right to seek redress of their grievance in Federal Court and use services of an attorney. Federal Judiciary has a Constitutional duty to address those grievances and provide an answer.

H. ACTIONS BY LAND IN DENYING MOTION TO RECUSE AND MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME WERE IMPROPER

a. The language used by Land was rude, unbecoming a judge and clearly showed bias. For example, when Taitz appeared before Land for the second time, representing Capt Rhodes, Land described it "repeated performance". He called her a "birther", which is a term minted by pro-Obama attack dogs in the media, who are not willing to call Obama-gate, for what it is, a legal matter of Obama's illegitimacy to the US presidency.

b. Land **intentionally misrepresented** the reason for withdrawal by the client. Taitz brought to court an affidavit from the client and plaintiff in the case, Capt. Rhodes. In her affidavit Rhodes stated that her commanding officer has threatened her with court martial. (affidavit is part of the docket). Additionally, Land assessed costs of litigation against the client. He never revealed, what was the amount of the costs and there is no record of Rhodes

ever paying those costs, so it was clear that a deal was made, whereby if Rhodes decides not to pursue the appeal, and if she dismisses Taitz as her counsel, costs against Rhodes would be waived by Land and/or military . Not only this issue of costs showed bias against Taitz, and reason for disqualification under 28 USC §455 (a), it needs to be investigated by an independent counsel as Judicial Misconduct by Land and violation of Taitz civil rights under the color of authority.

c. Assertion by Land, that the Request for withdrawal was not timely, is incorrect, as Taitz has made a §144 request as soon as she learned about bias.

d. Sanctions, is a serious matter, which would require a hearing. Request for enlargement of time and request for Land to recuse himself were reasonable. Just to show impartiality in the matter, it would be reasonable for Land to allow enlargement of time and step aside and let another judge look at the case and the evidence. The fact that Land refused to grant even the most minimal extension of time and refused to recuse himself was further evidence of bias.

I. LAND ERRED IN HIS ASSERTIONS , THAT THE INJURY WAS NOT IMMINENT.

In both cases, viewed by Land, the injury was not hypothetical, but imminent. Both Major Cook and Captain Rhodes are members of US military and were deployed to the military theaters of Afghanistan and Iraq respectively. Both officers were supposed to deploy in the matter of a couple of days. They were required to risk their lives and

possibly take lives of others, pursuant to Obama's orders. Risking one's life based on an order, that is likely to be illegitimate, or even possibly illegitimate, constitutes an imminent injury and an action asking for a hearing not frivolous. As such, sanctions were not justified.

Decision by Land encouraged more litigation and encouraged revolting by the members of the US military.

J. Actions by Land constituted violation of judicial ethics

Land has deemed Taitz legal actions to be frivolous and sanctionable based on his own judicial misconduct in both Cook and Rhodes cases, where actions of Land constituted violation of Judicial ethics and abuse of judicial discretion.

1. Land violated Judicial ethics and showed bias in not giving Taitz time to respond to the motion to dismiss in Cook v Good. Taitz didn't even have time to read the motion. These actions showed extreme bias and lack of judicial integrity, as well as **abuse of judicial discretion.**

2. Land abused his judicial discretion and violated judicial ethics in not considering two more plaintiffs, who joined the action of the underlying case of Cook v MacDonald.

3. Land abused Judicial discretion by completely disregarding the fact, that the issue of Obama's illegitimacy to US presidency is one that is repeated,

but continues to evade judicial review.

4. Land abused his Judicial discretion in refusing to consider valid arguments, specifically the fact that the military pressured Simteck, a small defense contractor, employer of Major Cook, to fire him from his $120,000 job in retaliation for the fact that he filed a legal action, questioning Obama's legitimacy to U.S. presidency. Similarly, Land abused his judicial discretion in not considering pressure on Rhodes, applied by the military, in order for her to dismiss her legal action.

K. ACTIONS BY LAND ARE AGAINST PUBLIC POLICY, ENDANGER THE PUBLIC AND ENDANGER NATIONAL SECURITY

Taitz has presented Land information, showing that Obama used multiple Social Security numbers of deceased individuals. Since the Commander in Chief has all of the US weapons arsenal is in his hands, particularly Nuclear arsenal, actions by the military officers and their attorney in ascertaining identity and his legitimacy are reasonable and not frivolous. Actions by a judge in attacking and harassing such members of the military and attacking their attorney with sanctions are unreasonable, go against Public Policy and endanger national security.

L. ACTIONS BY LAND WERE AKIN TO AIDING AND ABETTING FELONY AND MISPRISION OF FELONY.

Exhibits submitted by Taitz showed significant

likelihood of numerous felonies committed by Obama:

1. Title 42 USC §408(a)(7)(B) misuse of Social Security number punishable under 18 USC by fine or imprisonment of up to five years or both

2. 18 USC §1621 perjury with a penalty of fine or imprisonment of not more than five years or both

3. 18USC§ 371 conspiracy to defraud United States with a penalty of fine or imprisonment of not more then five years or both

4. As well as possibly other offenses, such as elections fraud, IRS fraud and others

The fact that Land refused to review any evidence, and attempted to intimidate Taitz with sanctions, assassinate her character and endanger her law license, means that he intentionally used his authority to aid and abet those crimes

IS A FEDERAL JUDGE ALLOWED TO PERSECUTE A CIVIL RIGHTS ATTORNEY AND SANCTION HER FOR MERELY BRINGING CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION CASES TO HIS COURT?

As shown in this brief, Land's order, loaded with insults and personal attacks and $20,000 sanctions amounted to nothing more, than persecution for bringing to his court a Civil Rights

violation case. Does a federal judge possess power to do so? There is nothing in the Constitution or statutes allowing such persecution. What can an attorney do to combat such persecution? Taitz is appealing to your Honors, Public Integrity Unit of the Department of Justice, as well as Civil rights Commission in Washington DC, Civil Rights defenders Commission with the United Nations and International Criminal Bar with the hope that sanity, civility and respect for Civil Constiututional rights will prevail.

ARE MEMBERS OF US MILITARY REDUCED TO THE LEVEL OF SLAVES OR SERFS, IF THEY ARE REFUSED A HEARING ON THE MERITS OF THEIR GRIEVANCES IN BOTH MILITARY AND FEDERAL COURTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS ARE HARASSED AND INTIMIDATED AND VERBALLY ASSAULTED BY A PRESIDING FEDERAL JUDGE?

Today United States of America is at war in two enormous military theatres in Iraq and Afghanistan. Lives of our soldiers and officers, as well as civilian,s in those regions are at stake. Today, more than ever those soldiers need to know, that they have a back, that they have a Commander in Chief they can trust and judges, who are fair and decide grievances based on the law and the Constitution and not their narrow personal interest and adherence to the administration no matter what. When members of the military face bias, lack of impartiality and outright personal attacks, they become demoralized. Taitz brought on behalf of her

clients important and reasonable grievances, and the Constitutional rights of the members of the military were violated.

CAN A FEDERAL JUDGE ARBITRARILY DECIDE, WHAT CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS CASE HE WANTS TO HEAR, AND WHICH CASE HE WILL NOT HEAR, AND ARBITRARILY SANCTION A CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENDER FOR BRINGING TO COURT A CASE THAT HE DOESN'T FEEL LIKE HEARING ON THE MERITS, AS IT IS NOT BENEFICIAL FOR HIS CAREER?

At the TRO hearing Land lashed out at Taitz, when she brought forward Thurgood Marshal and his fight for civil rights. Land considered the crusade by Marshal to be legitimate, but a crusade on behalf of the members of US military not to be legitimate, to be frivolous. A question arises: Can a Federal judge pick and choose: whose civil rights are important and whose rights are not important. When Federal judges pick and chose, they discriminate. It creates the worst kind of discrimination: not discrimination by an individual, but a discrimination by the government. We witnessed many examples, when policy by the government created legalized discrimination: holocaust, as well as slaughter of Armenian Christians in Turkey, massacres in Sudan and in Obama's native Kenya. Lady Liberty is blind for a reason: military officer ready to be shipped to the Middle East from Fort Benning GA, has as many civil rights and protection, as a school kid starting a school year in Columbus Georgia, or Alabama or

Mississippi. Justice and adherence to the law and Constitution have to be factually correct and legally correct, not politically correct. If this is not happening, the nation will simply lose trust in the system and will take matters in its own hands.

SHOULD A FEDERAL JUDGE FORWARD A CASE TO THE JURY FOR DETERMINATION ON ISSUES OF FACT AND LAW, WHEN A CASE INVOLVES A PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HIS LEGITIMACY AND ELIGIBILITY, WHICH BY DEFAULT, AFFECTS THE CAREER OF SUCH JUDGE?

Not long ago, in January of 2010 a well known judge in Mississippi, Bobby Delaughter ended up pleading guilty and sentenced to 18 months in Federal prison for public corruption, giving a decision to a party, who could help him reach a higher court.

In cases at hand situation was similar and even worse. Taitz represented clients, who challenged legitimacy of the sitting president. Who is in the best position to give a Federal judge a promotion, but the sitting president? For this reason alone, Land had to give the jury an opportunity to decide on the merits. When there was a clear indication of bias and Taitz requested recusal of Land, it was his duty to avoid impartiality or even appearance of impartiality and recuse himself. Moreover, a witness approached Taitz and forwarded to her a sworn affidavit, stating, that he observed Attorney General Eric Holder at the coffee house across the street from the courthouse during Cook v

Good hearing conducted by Land. Taitz has no ability to ascertain if attorney General Holder was there or not, however it was possible, and in the spirit of zealous representation of her clients she had to raise this issue. Due to all of the above mentioned reasons, Land had to recuse himself. Land did none of the above. As such he violated the rules of judicial ethics.

Is the whole nation de facto reduced to the level of slaves or serfs, when one without valid vital records, without Social Security number of his own and without a valid long form birth certificate is able to get in the position of the President; and Congress is refusing to hear this issue, claiming that it is for the courts to decide and the courts are refusing to hear this issue, claiming that it is for the Congress to decide?

Today the whole nation lives in some type of surreal "No Man's Land." As noted above Mr. Obama has never provided any vital records that would be accepted by any court of law. Over a 100 legal actions were filed. No judge assumed jurisdiction. While judge David O. Carter in Central District of CA initially assumed jurisdiction, he relinquished it after Obama succeeded in placing one of attorneys from his defense firm Perkins-Coie as a law clerk for Carter. Desperate citizens have organized into citizen Grand Juries, those Grand Juries indicted Obama of voter fraud and elections fraud, and in some cases treason, yet no DA, no US attorney no judge assumed jurisdiction to act upon those

indictments. When an individual can get to the top position of power without providing any vital records and judiciary is evading hearing this issue on the merits, each and every member of the public is de facto reduced to a level of a serf, a slave.

Should there be a decision from the Supreme court, clarifying legitimacy of US president or an order to the lower court to hear the issue on the merits?

When one comes to the realization that there is a need to hear the issue of eligibility of the US president on the merits and that the Nation requires this issue to be heard in the near future, it becomes clear that there has to be a determination of the Supreme court, as to whose obligation is it to verify proper vital records and verify eligibility of the President. It seems that this issue simply fell through the cracks. Different states and federal agencies are playing a game of political football. Secretaries of state are not willing to check the records and point to federal agencies, FBI and US attorneys point to Congress, Congress points to the courts. DNC simply took out the words "eligible according to the Constitution" from the certification of the Candidate in an attempt to get out of their liability in such a manner. There has to be a determination by the Supreme Court, the highest court in the country, whether a person, holding the highest executive position in the land is eligible and legitimate, and what state and federal agencies are supposed to verify such eligibility in the future.

What Constitutes "natural born citizen"

according to Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution?

If hypothetically Obama possess a valid original type written birth certificate from Hawaii, with the name of the doctor and the name of the hospital, does that make him a Natural born US citizen, is it sufficient in light of the fact, that his father never was a US citizen and in light of the fact that at birth Obama had a British citizenship based on British Nationality act of 1948, as his father was a British protected person from a British colony of Kenya. Later at age two, on December 11, 1963 Obama became a Kenyan citizen, as Kenya got its Independence, and around age five he got an Indonesian citizenship, as his mother married an Indonesian citizen, and the family immigrated to Indonesia. There has to be a determination by the highest court in the land, whether one with split allegiance at birth and through life can be considered a Natural Born citizen. Many seem to believe, that one is a Natural born citizen, provided he was born in this country, regardless of the citizenship of his parents and regardless of their allegiance. Many point to a definition in the Black Law dictionary, that defines a Natural Born Citizen, as one simply born in the Country.

Not long ago the Supreme Court heard the case of District of Columbia v Heller where it painstakingly reviewed the initial intent of the framers of the Constitution in regards to the second amendment. But what about Article 2, section 1 of the Constitution?

Some quote the 14th amendment. But what was the intent of the 14th amendment? It did provide citizenship to slaves, who didn't have it at the time, however it is questionable and debatable whether it envisioned granting US citizenship and full benefits of free education and all the welfare benefits to millions of anchor babies of people who are here illegally or even legally for a short time on a tourist visa or a student visa. Even if, arguendo, one comes to a conclusion, that 14th amendment guarantees US citizenship to anyone, regardless of allegiance to other nations, it still does not mention Natural born status, that is needed for the US presidency.

As many of followers of Taitz were sending Black law dictionaries to her, she traced all of the editions and found that the earliest Black Law dictionary was published some 100 years after the Constitution was adopted, so there was a need to find a legal treatise, a legal dictionary used by the framers of the Constitution. Such legal treatise happened to be the Law of Nations by well known Swiss diplomat and attorney Emer De Vatel. French and English versions of the Law of Nations were repeatedly used by Adams, Jefferson and Franklin. Article 1, section 7 of the Constitution mentions the Law of Nations as a reference to source of powers of Congress in case of piracy at seas. Law of Nations defines **"Natural born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens"** Les Droit Des Gens ou Principes De Loi Naturelle, 1958. So, Vatelle's answer to the age old question: where does allegience lie, is it in the genes, is it in the blood or is it the soil? The answer: it is both. Vattel is saying that it is "jus solis" and "jus sanguinis". Was this

definition consistent with the frame of mind of the founders of this Nation? Founders of this Nation were concerned about foreign usurpation. First Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Jay famously warned George Washington about the danger of foreigners in the position of the Commander in Chief. Framer of the 14th amendment John a Bingham quoted as stating that "natural born citizens are ones, born in the US territory to parents who don't owe allegiance to any other sovereignties". Even if it is found that Mr. Obama somehow miraculously can pass Constitutional muster for US Presidency, questions raised by Taitz were reasonable, appropriate, related to the duties of her clients and important to be resolved for future generations of Americans.

Wherefore the appellant respectfully requests:

1. Reversal of sanctions wrongfully assessed against her by Judge Clay D. Land

2. Rule 11 limited discovery of Mr. Obama' s vital records, to show that the legal action, for which Taitz was sanctioned, was justified.

3. Sua sponte assignment to the Independent Prosecutor the information on the underlying case for purpose of investigation, if indeed a deal was made, where plaintiff Capt. Rhodes dismissed Taitz as her counsel in exchange for waiver of costs, asserted against her by Judge Land and department of Defense.

4. Sua sponte assignment to the independent

Prosecutor and public integrity unit evidence of Obama's illegitimacy to US presidency, provided in underlying cases of Cook v Good and Rhodes v MacDonald for prosecution under Title 18, §1961.

5. cost and reasonable fees of appeal.

CONCLUSION

If the ruling in *Rhodes* is permitted to stand, all attorneys who take a politically inconvenient stance against the eligibility of a sitting President will be potentially subjected to F.R.CP. Rule 11 sanctions. This is tantamount to state sponsored repression of political dissent and violates the First, Fifth and Ninth Amendments. *Rhodes* also directly conflicts with the spirit of this Court's ruling in *Offutt v. United States* which calls for restraint by the judiciary in sanctioning attorneys *sua sponte* not because of contumacious behavior, but because of their zealous speech and representation.

Therefore, petitioner requests that this Court grant this Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ
29839 Santa Margarita Pkwy
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
Tel. 949-683-5411